DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 654 EA 024 098

AUTHOR Grayson, Dolores A.
TITLE Classroom and Site-Based Leadership Development: Increasing Achievement and Participation for All Students with an Emphasis on Underserved Populations.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Leadership; *Leadership Training; *Nondiscriminatory Education; *Professional Development; Racial Bias; Sex Bias; *Staff Development; Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

Outcomes of two leadership programs designed to increase achievement and participation for all students are reviewed in this paper, which addresses educational disparity. The first program, the Gender/Ethnic Expectations and Students Achievement (GESA) program, has four goals: to reduce the disparity in the frequency and quality of student/teacher interactions; to reduce stereotyping by teachers; to improve classroom climate; and to improve student achievement. Piloted in Los Angeles County, California, it has been implemented nationwide. Suggested evaluation methodology includes pre-post classroom observations, pre-post achievement test data, and posttraining questionnaires. The second program, a site-based leadership development project, attempted to integrate an increased awareness of disparity in administrators' teacher supervision practices. Nationwide clusters of site-based school administrators explored four function areas of leadership: curriculum and instructional leadership; school management; staff development; and parent/community outreach. Recommendations are made for preparing and recruiting diverse populations in educational leadership, for expressing equity measures in educational policies at every level, for formulating a holistic community agenda, and for providing students with a global model of coexistence. Two figures and one table are included. (39 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED347654

CLASSROOM AND SITE-BASED LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT: INCREASING ACHIEVEMENT AND PARTICIPATION FOR ALL STUDENTS WITH AN EMPHASIS ON UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS

DOLORES A. GRAYSON, Ph.D.

GRAYMILL CONSULTING
2029 352nd PLACE
EARLHAM, IA 50072
515)834-2431

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Grayson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992

(Do not reproduce or quote without written permission from the author)

EA 024 098

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Classroom and Site-Based Leadership Development: Increasing Achievement and Participation for All Students with an Emphasis on Underserved Populations

Dolores A. Grayson, Ph.D.

With the continuing focus on developing effective educational leadership, site-based management with participatory representation has been repeatedly identified as a "gatekeeper" to educational excellence. Principals and other administrators need to be sensitive to equity issues so they can help teachers and community members perform without bias, choose appropriate instructional materials, develop curricula and create an environment in which all students can achieve. Education in the 90's needs administrators, teachers and community members who are equipped to be effective leaders, capable of addressing concerns which continue to deal students out of the quest for excellence. Following numerous site observations, discussions with practitioners and a review of literature on educational equity issues related to gender, race, socioeconomic class and effective schooling, two leadership programs were developed to meet these needs.

The first followed an eight year literature review and extensive time comparing strategies, classroom observation data and experiences. Included in the findings was the identification of certain trends or major areas of disparity in classrooms. In addition, the authors identified specific positive, supportive and motivational behaviors or interactions teachers tend to use with students from whom they expect the most. Finally, there were specific curriculum related areas identified which had serious equity implications and for which a number of recent resources had been developed. As a result, the Gender/Ethnic Expectations and Students Achievement (GESA) teacher training program and materials were produced. (Grayson & Martin, 1984, 1988, rev. 1990)

The second focuses on working with administrators and administrative aspirants. Participants were made aware of the aforementioned areas of disparity and behaviors to include in the supervision and observation of teachers. Four function areas were explored with clusters of site-based managers around the United States. These function areas included curriculum and instructional leadership, school management leadership, staff development leadership and parent and community outreach leadership. From the clusters, a synthesis of persistent equity concerns and recommendations were compiled.

This paper includes an overview of the two programs, summaries of results from the last several years of combined program implementation and the effects on student participation and achievement.

Need/Rationale

Since the 1983 report, *A Nation at Risk,* from the Commission on Educational Excellence, several additional reports and hundreds of papers have been published on the topic. Not one of the six original reports contained any information related to gender or race disparity and very little was mentioned regarding the implications of socioeconomic class on student success. In the last nine years, much time and money have been spent on increasing standards, standardized tests and, raising graduation requirements. However, there is an extensive body of literature, including the results of numerous teacher training workshops, (Grayson & Martin, 1984) which proves overwhelmingly that educators must attend to issues of opportunity, access, treatment and quality of instruction in order to equip students to meet increased standards.

Educational reform which increases standards and graduation requirements without directly addressing the lack of comparable opportunity, disparate treatment and inequitable perceptions, expectations and instruction is irresponsible reform. Responsible educators need to hone their skills in meeting the needs indicated by changing demographics and to serve the "students at risk" in this society. When one takes into account the traditional classroom structures, strategies catering to limited learning styles, exclusionary materials, displays and role models, and environments ranging from unfriendly to hostile , the definition of student at risk is expanded to a much larger percentage than is commonly described (Slavin, Karweit & Madden, 1989). Equity concerns related to gender, race, physical and developmental disability, national origin, dominant language, sexual orientation and socioeconomic class compound the risks.

A system developed to provide education for the sons of wealthy landowners is no longer meeting the needs of our diverse population. Outmoded materials and strategies delivered in eroding environments from biased individuals are not conducive to learning. A system funded by budgets which may be slashed at the whim of politicians who send their children to private, exclusive schools is a system doomed to failure It is time for policy and decision makers to stop viewing diversity as a problem to be solved. It is time to equip teachers and administrators to utilize diversity as an enhancement to learning. The programs described herein are committed to that goal.

I. Classroom Leadership Development

Educational results for females and males of all cultural and ethnic groups and their economic consequences are determined by many factors, not all found in the school setting. But what happens in school is important. As previous data analysis from studies on teacher expectations and student achievement (Grayson & Martin, 1984, 1988, 1990), and other research (Sadker & Sadker, 1982, 1984 &

1985) indicate, classroom teachers consistently interact more frequently with males than with females, and all groups in the educational setting still perceive males as high achievers more often than females. The results of numerous teacher observations indicate repeatedly that the student with whom teachers interact the least on either a positive or negative basis is the perceived high achieving female. Yet in the 1980's, the major studies addressing excellence and reform in education in the United States totally ignored issues related to gifted and other underachieving females and many males from diverse backgrounds.

More recent studies in the 1990's indicate that many of the exclusionary patterns persist (AAUW, 1991 & 1992). Problems still exist with the representation of diverse populations, females and males in instructional materials. Although overt stereotyping may not be as common as it was 20 years ago, more subtle bias persists in classrooms, society and the home environment which continue to hurt many people and limit their full participation in the learning process. The manner in which teachers and other significant adults treat students reflects this bias. Traditional perceptions of what is appropriate and inappropriate for certain males and females still shape teacher expectations and these perceived expectations have a direct impact on teacher behavior. These often distorted and limited perceptions, expectations and behaviors correlate to achievement and academic success, or lack of it.

This portion of the paper will report the accumulated findings of over a decade of work with literally thousands of teachers, teacher educators and administrators representing 47 states in the USA and five other countries. The GESA program was designed to help teachers examine biases as demonstrated by their own behavior toward students. Once this happens, necessary curricular and environmental changes are accepted more easily. The focus will be on what has been learned about behaviors which counter the major areas of disparity, the impact on achievement, attitudes and self-esteem and persistent problematic areas for future research.

Review of Literature and Related Research Patterns

The developmental and pilot phase of the GESA program was the topic of a previous paper (Grayson & Martin, 1984). The field-test, preliminary data analysis and implementation were discussed in a second paper (Grayson, 1985). A comprehensive handbook has been published to accompany the program (Grayson & Martin, 1984, rev.1990). In addition to the teacher workshops and the handbook, a three-day facilitator workshop has been developed in a trainer-of-trainers model. This is accompanied by a facilitator publication (Grayson, & Martin, 1988) and is designed to prepare participants to conduct the teacher workshops. A third paper describes the extent to which the

program was disseminated at the national level during the first five years; reports the findings of a formal validation study conducted in a California district; and shares recommendations for further study and future plans (Grayson, 1987). All three previous papers were presented at annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association and are on file in the Educational Resources Information Clearinghouse (ERIC).

A synthesis of the literature, including a research update during the last four years, indicates that the need to continue to address educational disparity persists. The findings referenced here span several decades. Consequently, the first section identifies and summarizes the literature on five major areas of disparity; the second section defines effective behaviors and patterns between teachers and students; and the third section pertains to curriculum content.

When the national dissemination commenced, the GESA program was among the first to attempt to apply solutions across parallel equity issues even though many of the original studies had focused exclusively on gender. The Areas of Disparity have proven to be generic and are applicable to concerns related to gender, race, national origin, developmental or physical disability, socioeconomic class, sexual orientation, perceived ability, or any of the labels which tend to deal people or permit them to deal themselves in or out of the educational system. The ways in which the disparities manifest themselves may differ within and between specific groups. A consistent finding has been that the range of diversity is greater within groups than between groups.

The objectives of the program are to reduce the disparity in the frequency distribution and quality of interactions with students by teachers; to reduce stereotyping by teachers; to increase non-stereotypical interaction with students; to improve classroom climate; and to increase student achievement. The conceptual framework includes three factors generally accepted to influence academic achievement. These include the learning environment, classroom interactions and the curriculum content and materials, .

A. Areas of Disparity

1. Instructional Contact

During the sixties and seventies, many researchers examined teacher interaction with high and low achieving students. These studies suggested that instructional contact differs for males and females (Good, Sikes & Brophy, 1973, 1978 & 1987) (Sadker & Sadker, 1982).

Consistently, studies and practice have proven that attention is directly correlated to achievement. In the typical classroom (or group) in the United States, one or two or three salient people occupy a minimum of 25% of the instructor's time by calling out, raising their hand or demanding attention in

some assertive way. More often than not, the salient person is male and white. Conversely, in a typical classroom, a minimum of 25% of the participants receive no contact from the instructor. This appears to be the case whether the instructor is male or female. Clearly, in this society, the "squeaky wheel gets the oil" in most group settings. Evidently, in many classrooms (or groups), the student is the stimulus to the instructor's behavior, in concert with the instructor's perceived expectations for the student. In many classrooms, instruction is a very reactive or responsive activity. Those responsible for instruction need to examine their own perceptions and expectations and take the initiative for their own actions and interactions with others.

2. Grouping and Organization

Classroom organization refers to physical environment and social structure. The teacher usually decides how to cluster students and products. Seating patterns, work groups, recreational activities, classroom chores, team composition, and peer interaction reflect how teachers expect students to work and play together. Students throughout elementary school voluntarily group themselves by gender. This preference for playing and working with students of the same sex is a powerful tool for (and a result of) sex role socialization. Classroom management and instructional groupings based on gender reinforce the separation of the sexes so that females and males are segregated both in the classroom and at play. In the United States, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Title VI and Title IX of the 1972 Educational Amendments and the 1988 Civil Rights Restoration Act prohibit classroom grouping based on gender and race. Nevertheless, in 1984 the Sadkers (*Newsletter: Project Effect*, 1984) reported that "one out of every three classrooms is segregated by sex" and in 1992 the participants in the GESA training sessions report that students continue to self segregate by gender, race and other characteristics not necessarily conducive to learning.

3. Classroom Management/Discipline

Researchers have repeatedly found that males receive more criticism and more punishment than females. This both reflects and reinforces the stereotype of females as docile and males as aggressive. According to several studies spanning the 70s and 80s, including Serbin, et al, 1973, and the Sadkers', 1982, even when males and females are misbehaving equally, the males are more likely to get harsher reprimands. More recent GESA observations have validated the same (Grayson & Martin, 1984, rev. 1990; Grayson, 1985; Grayson, 1987). Most educators know that males receive more punishment, referrals, suspensions and expulsions than females and African American, Latino American and low socioeconomic European American males are the major recipients, far exceeding their representation in the student population.

4. Enhancing Self-Esteem/Self-Concept

At a very early age, males are programmed to be males and females to be females. Each are expected to play roles which have been refined over time. Parents and significant others impose limits and expectations which profoundly affect development of the self-concept. Society still perpetuates male/female expectations and limits which have an enormous and frequently adverse effect on the self-concepts, choices and lives of both males and females (Best, 1983, 1989).

We are all familiar with the traditional sex stereotypes, the conditioning which perpetuates them, and the self-concepts which emerge. We are seeing revolutionary changes in these stereotypes. Men are being encouraged to be gentle, nurturing, and to share their emotions. Women are taking courses in self-assertion and demanding equity in the work place. Despite these expanded visions of male/female roles, individuals are slow to change. Raphaela Best (1983, 1989) described her four-year effort in the mid-seventies to free her elementary students from the restrictions imposed by sex role socialization. In GESA workshops, we hear similar stories (Grayson and Martin, 1984, 1988, rev. 1990). These limitations are compounded by perceptions based on the multiple factors of race, socioeconomic class, religion, dominant language, sexual orientation, ability level, physical and developmental challenges and other influential characteristics.

The educational system is a crucial force in shaping the self concepts of females and males from a variety of backgrounds. Studies indicate that cross-culturally, both males and females have been taught that being male is inherently better than being female. (Baumgartner-Papageorgiou,1982). The messages children receive about their gender, race, class, etc. greatly influence how they perceive their own worth and how they perceive that significant others perceive them.

5. Evaluation of Performance

Considerable evidence suggests that our views of females as good with words and males as good with numbers affects both how we evaluate their learning and what they actually learn. A number of studies have documented that schools respond to students of varying race, class and gender statuses in systematically different ways. These reinforce differential performances and evaluations in classrooms. Many traditional school policies regarding grading and testing have influenced groups negatively. The most frequently used models of standardized testing have been proven repeatedly to favor middle and upper class white students and males over females. Traditional forms of ability grouping and other forms of tracking have fallen along class, race and gender lines, yet we ignore our own research and continue to sort, screen and attempt to predict success utilizing similar instrumentation (Scott-Jones and Clark, 1986; Grant, 1986; Klein, 1985; Shakeshaft, 1986; Oakes, 1980; and Padilla & Wyatt, 1983).

All of the preceding information influences the manner in which people are evaluated. Three major themes have emerged as instructors assess performance:

a. Generally, males are given feedback directly related to the task, content or thought process involved. More often than not, females are given feedback related to the appearance of their work. Appearance is a dominant influence related to females in many aspects of their lives.

b. Next, "effort" statements are used more frequently with males, than with females. (ie. "Carlos, if you tried harder in this class, you could do it. You just need to put forth more effort!) With females, the emphasis is frequently limited to whether they have exerted any effort at all. (ie. Maria, you had trouble with this homework, didn't you? Well, you tried!) In the example, Carlos is given the message that he has the ability, but is not using it. Maria is given the message that she doesn't have the work because she doesn't have the ability. The message is that less is expected and accepted. This same differential can be observed when students are the same gender, but different races or perceived levels of ability (Grayson & Martin, 1984 & 1988, rev. 1990).

c. Finally, there is a disparate pattern with the students who are told to "read back through" an assignment, or "work through" a problem themselves, and those for whom the instructor is willing to do the work, explain in detail, or demonstrate. Frequently, instructors, employers and parents feed into a phenomenon called "learned helplessness" through subtle interactions such as finishing sentences or taking pencils (or other objects) out of a person's hand and doing the task for her or him. This can prove to have a very negative effect on one's perception of one's capabilities.

B. Interaction Patterns

Numerous studies discuss the impact of classroom interactions on student achievement. The behaviors that go on between students, between teachers, between administrators and the various combinations are all important. However, there is general agreement that the interaction patterns which most influence student achievement are the behaviors between the teacher and the student (Brophy & Good, 1970; Good & Brophy, 1978 & 1987; Flanders, 1964; Grayson & Martin, 1984 & 1988, rev. 1990; and, Fennema & Peterson, 1986).

When observing classrooms and/or supervising teachers about equity concerns related to interaction, it is important to address quantity and quality. In the following behavior categories, the first two provide information on frequency distribution patterns in classrooms. The remaining eight are specific behaviors used in positive and supportive ways with students for whom teachers have high expectations. All have implications for the traditional ways in which they have been directed toward students, depending on the teachers' perceived expectations related to student characteristics.

1. Response Opportunities

A teacher provides a response opportunity by giving a student a chance to perform. The response is related to the classroom instruction. Response opportunities include asking students to answer questions, contribute to discussions, state opinions, write on the board, present something to the class, etc. Most teachers do not consciously treat students unfairly, yet differential treatment often happens. In subtle but important ways teachers communicate that some students are more valued than others. Students are less apt to learn from someone who doesn't like them or doesn't expect them to learn. Students who are asked the easy questions by teachers don't have a chance to develop intellectual skills or to express opinions. When they are asked questions to which there is one right answer and they miss, they feel embarrassed. Expressing opinions is fun and allows an entry into discussion or task participation. These consequences are compounded by the reactions of other students. They notice who receives specific types of assignments or gets certain types of attention from the teacher. Students who become type-cast as appropriate for certain kinds of instructional contact become less aggressive in seeking changes. The limitations established by the teacher's (Grayson, 1990).

2. Acknowledgment of Response/Feedback

Communication theory emphasizes the importance of feedback in modifying our behavior so that the consequences of our behavior come closer to our intentions. Teachers know how important feedback is to learning but spend little time analyzing the impact of the feedback given to students. The surprising thing about feedback in the classroom is the lack of it. Sometimes teachers do not react in any way when a student performs or answers a question. The most frequent form of feedback is simple acceptance, for example, a nod or verbal "okay" or "un huh" (Sadker & Sadker, 1984). Research findings generally agree that male students receive more feedback than female students. (Grayson & Martin, 1984 & 1988, rev. 1990).

3. Wait Time

The time that elapses between offering and terminating a response opportunity is called "wait time" (Rowe, 1969 & 1986). The length of time tends to be longest when the teacher asks questions which require the student to interpret or reorganize the facts or to form an opinion. The average time that a teacher waits for a student to respond to a question is approximately 2.6 seconds. The teacher waits an average of 5.0 seconds if a correct response is anticipated and curtails the wait time to less than 1.0 second if the student is expected to give an incorrect answer or to not respond at all. During the GESA pilot study, this interaction was identified by teachers as having the most impact on the quality of responses and increasing the participation of previously quieter "invisible" female students and students for whom English was not the dominant language (Grayson & Martin, 1984 & 1988, rev. 1990).

4. Physical Closeness

Teachers often organize classrooms in ways which determine where individual students will be located. Some students may be unconsciously kept at a distance. When given the opportunity to choose, this is one of the most obvious ways students deal themselves in and out of participating in a class. Physical closeness means that the student and teacher are conducting their classroom activities near each other (within an arm's reach or within the same quadrant of the room) at least for a time. In most classrooms, favored locations can be easily spotted. These are the work locations of students who get the most attention. In a classroom in which students move among work stations, the favored location may shift frequently. Several observation studies have examined room arrangement and teacher mobility and the impact on achievement, especially in science and math, and on classroom management (Adams & Biddle, 1970; Rist, 1972; Raby & Suite, 1982; and, Fifer, 1986).

A teacher can remedy the uneven distribution of physical closeness by moving about the room with the intention of being near each student for a time. If the classroom environment makes this impossible, the teacher can routinely move the students or suggest that they move. A combination of teacher and student movement in a variety of groupings appears to be most effective, according to reports from previous GESA participants and field tests (Grayson & Martin, 1984 & 1988, rev. 1990),

5. Touching

Discussions, responses and studies pertaining to touch indicate a variety of attitudes toward this interaction. Many people have an aversion to touching. Their reasons vary. Some regard contact as a physical attack and respond very quickly and harshly. Others are afraid to touch because of the potential consequences. Rules and regulations in many schools forbid physical contact between teacher and student. Both parties are sensitized to their personal rights which they do not want violated. The positive form of touch which has been identified in classrooms between teachers and the students from whom they expect the most is in no way sexual or abusive.

Considerable research indicates that teachers are most apt to be physically close to and to touch perceived faster learners(Good & Brophy, 1978 & 1987). Who the teacher touches may also depend on the student's age and the gender and ethnicity of both teacher and student(Grayson & Martin, 1984 & 1988, rev. 1990).

6. Reproof

Reproof is the verbal or nonverbal indication that a student's behavior is not acceptable. Reproof which is firm but calm, unemotional and respectful is more effective than angry outbursts. In GESA, the

focus of reproof is on the behavior, not the person. Although the research reveals mixed findings, the following trends are discernible (Grayson & Martin, 1984 & 1988, rev.1990):

- more males than females are referred to school authorities;
- teachers tend to notice more disruptive behavior from males when it occurs-- and sometimes when it does not occur;
- males receive more severe disciplinary action than females.
- "minority" students are most harshly treated, especially Blacks and especially when measured by school suspension records or referrals.

7. Probing

If a student cannot answer a question, the teacher may supply the answer, call on another student, or stay with the student who could not answer, probing for a response. Probing may involve rephrasing the question, providing clues, providing additional information, suggesting an appropriate thought process for getting to the answer, or reminding the student of related information already known. Probing is a powerful teaching tool. When probing elicits an acceptable response, the student feels successful and the concept of self as student is enhanced. Teachers are less inclined to encourage females to risk or expand a response. If the teacher always accepts a student's "I don't know" or non-response without probing, that student learns to avoid risking a response (Grayson and Martin, 1984, 1988).

8. Listening

Listening is a powerful way of relating to another person. We all have a need to be heard, to hold someone's attention. Yet, the research reveals a number of insights about listening patterns in the traditional classrooms from which most of us came and about teachers as listeners. Females and males grow up in essentially different cultures within cultural groups, so talk between genders is also cross-cultural communication (Tannen, 1990).

In the United States and in many cultures around the world, females are taught to be listeners and males are encouraged to speak. Consequently, females generally have more difficulty than males in getting attention when they wish to say something. This process circles back to denigrate the importance of what females say. Males have been less motivated to develop listening skills which is a limitation in interpersonal relations. Perhaps the intuitive powers sometimes attributed to women are the result of listening and attending to the feelings of others (Grayson & Martin, 1984 & 1988, rev. 1990).

9. Higher Level Questioning

Often teachers ask students questions which require only that the student recall something from a reading assignment or previous instruction. This type of question is often useful and appropriate, but the

questions which move the learning along and challenge the students to think are those which require more complex mental processes than simple recall. Although inconsistencies appear in the literature, studies generally seem to suggest that males are given more opportunities to respond to higher level questions.

The student who is called upon to answer a question or perform in some other way is usually in a more compelling learning situation than a student who is merely listening to the exchange. A student who is called upon to answer a higher level question is in an even more compelling situation. Therefore, if a teacher falls into the habit of asking simple recall questions of some students and reserving the higher level questions for a select group of students, an inequitable situation exists. Some students are receiving a lower quality of instruction than other students (Grayson & Martin, 1984 & 1988, rev. 1990).

10. Analytical Feedback

In a previous section the importance of acknowledging a student's response and giving feedback in general was considered. When concentrating on higher level questions, there are more opportunities for analytical feedback. Student's responses to higher level questions offer more opportunities to explain the strengths and weaknesses of the response than simple recall questions. Analytical feedback gives a reason for the acceptance, praise, rejection or correction. It explains why the student's response is satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

The research informs us that, in general, males are told the lack of success is linked to lack of effort. Females, on the other hand, receive messages that lack of success is due to lack of ability. This difference in analytical feedback could account for the findings in attribution studies regarding student success and failure. Causal attribution is one of the factors which influence internal motivational beliefs and cause people to deal themselves in and/or out of programs, practices and systems (Fennema & Peterson, 1985 & 1986). The implications for a student's approach and willingness to try intellectual tasks is enormous. How long will a female keep trying if she thinks she simply can't do something? One consequence of believing that failure is insurmountable is that students acquire learned helplessness - - a sense that they have no control over the factors that cause failure. Consequently, this learned helplessness leads to declining performance.

C. Curriculum Areas

Ninety percent of student learning time is spent using educational materials. Reading about successful women has been found to cause females to have higher expectations of female success, an important component of achievement (Campbell, 1984). Some of the most persistent obstacles to equitable career choices, college study and employment are the subject areas of Math, Science and Computer Learning.

The importance of these specific subjects as areas of concern warrants special attention. The equity implications and research on these subjects are extensive. As females move into adolescence, their interest in science usually wanes and their achievement lags behind that of males. It is not uncommon for gifted adolescent females to repress their academic abilities or opt out of advanced math and science to avoid risking their grade point average. The role of mathematician or scientist is perceived as masculine, although many of these same females will choose careers which require math or science skills. They later regret their decisions and/or lack of encouragement. The curriculum portion of the GESA program addresses a variety of these equity concerns and introduces current resources in specific content areas.

III. Dissemination and Assessment

The GESA program was developed as a model to be disseminated at the national level. It was piloted in Los Angeles County, California, which forms a microcosm of the United States. In 1983-84, the county included 95 school districts which served over 1.2 million students and varied greatly in population characteristics.

Districts ranged in size from Los Angeles Unified with over 700 schools to Gorman with one. The county had urban, suburban, and rural districts. Some were dominantly white, others dominantly Hispanic, African American, Asian and Pacific Islander. A few were wealthy enclaves, such as Beverly Hills and San Marino, while others like Compton served mostly low-income populations.

The 1986 public school population was 44.3% Hispanic; 31.1% White; 14.8% Black; 8.0% Asian, Pacific Islander; 1.5% Filipino; and 0.3% American Indian. 512,839 students claimed a "primary language other than English" in April, 1986. Eighty-seven different languages were spoken by students. Consequently, the GESA program was developed, piloted and field-tested to address the needs of a culturally diverse population and has been very well received in cities such as Seattle, Washington; Portland, Oregon; San Diego, California; and Prince George's County, Maryland, where districts are dealing with issues of disproportionality and high immigration rates.

A major vehicle for dissemination has been the combination of the three day facilitator training coordinated for multiple district representatives by personnel in the state departments of education through the Title-IV Civil Rights Act and Vocational Education federally funded programs. This approach has been utilized in such states as Montana, Washington, Nebraska, South Dakota, Iowa, Kansas, Alaska, Missouri, Arkansas, Hawaii, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New Mexico, Maryland, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, North Dakota, Idaho, Utah, Colorado, Ohio and Wyoming. In some instances, individual school districts have opted to host their own trainings. These include, but are not

limited to Minneapolis, Minnesota; Tucson, Arizona; Dekalb County, Georgia; Des Moines, Iowa; and San Diego, California. The Eisenhower funding for mathematics and science improvement has been instrumental in providing training in Texas and North Carolina and frequent collaboration with the regional equity assistance centers have resulted in representatives from multiple states. Additional participants have come from the Netherlands, Australia, Canada, England and Israel.

Over 5000 facilitators have been trained, representing forty-seven states and five countries, in less than ten years. Over five hundred more are scheduled to be trained by the conclusion of the summer (September, 1992).

A. **Suggested Methodology for Measuring Program Effectiveness**

- Pre/post classroom observations
- Pre/post achievement test data
- Post training questionnaire

Pre/post measures are used to determine the amount of growth in teacher interactions with students, changes in attitudes of teachers and students, and student achievement gains.

Classroom Observations:

These are conducted prior to GESA instruction and at the completion of the program. Data for teachers can be combined and analyzed to determine disparity in teacher/student interactions by gender and ethnicity. A Post-training questionnaire consist of six items designed to elicit teacher reaction to program content, outcomes for students, and curriculum resources recommended during the training.

Test Data Analysis:

Individual scale scores on the following subtests can be used from Basic Skills Tests: Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, Total Reading, Mathematics Computation, Mathematics Concepts and Applications, and Total Mathematics

Sample of Findings:

Observations - In this example, three interactions were selected from the training matrix to be observed: response opportunities, physical closeness, and higher level questions.

Table 1 displays the number of pre-post interactions observed for males and females. The table displays the frequency with which males and females received each response or interaction from the teacher. As indicated, the total number of responses and interactions between students and teachers increased for every item.

The closer the answer is to 1.0 the more equitable the number of interactions received for each group. Values greater than 1.0 indicate an overrepresentation of that interaction by the group studied. Values less than 1.0 indicate underrepresentation. Positive or negative numbers indicate that a particular student group was over- or underrepresented, respectively, for that particular interaction. For ease of interpretation, results were then converted to percents. **Table 1** presents the disparity of interactions by gender.

TABLE 1

SHARE OF RESPONSES BY MALE AND FEMALE

Interaction		Male Percent	Female Percent
Response Opportunities	Pre	+24	-29
	Post	+07	-07
Physical Closeness	Pre	-20	+25
	Post	-16	+19
Higher Order Questions	Pre	+14	-13
	Post	+09	-08

This table demonstrates that males are overrepresented in Response Opportunities and Higher Order Questions, with a marked improvement between pre-post observations. Females continued to be underrepresented in these two categories, but to a lesser degree in the post observations. Teachers demonstrate higher incidence of physical closeness with females in their classes than males. Physical closeness was coded when a teacher stopped within arms reach of a student.

In addition to the recorded data, changes in classroom climate are also noted by the observers. The following comments illustrate the quality of the changes which occur in the classroom of teachers who complete the training.

> "The changes in the classroom climate from the pre to the post observation were dramatic. I especially saw differences at the secondary level. In two classes during the pre observations, the teachers had very stilted and limited interaction with their students. The whole "feel" of the classroom changed. During the post observations, these same two teachers seemed relaxed and comfortable in their interactions with students. Even in the secondary classrooms where

the pre observation showed a lot of interaction, the amount and quality of the interactions were greatly improved by the post observation. To me, the effect of GESA training seemed to be an improvement in the classroom climate as much as in the equitable treatment of students."

"I was particularly impressed by the improvement in classroom tone from pre- to post-observations. In one class, during the pre-observation, the teacher stood behind a podium and spent the majority of class time threatening students about their misbehavior. Teacher and students were much more comfortable and respectful during the post-observation. Everyone seemed to enjoy themselves and the entire period was spent on instruction."

Teacher Evaluation. Teachers who complete the GESA program are asked to respond to a written questionnaire during during the sixth workshop. The questionnaire is designed to elicit teacher reaction to program content, outcomes for students, and curriculum resources made available during the training.

Overall, teachers feel strongly that GESA improves their teaching abilities, classroom climates and students' abilities to learn and relate well to others. Repeatedly, teachers indicate that GESA provides them with a strong tool for self-evaluation of their teaching strategies and behaviors. Additionally, participants are pleased by the increased learning responses, changes in behavior of their students and with the opportunities they have to observe other professionals at work.

Achievement Data

The two most exciting and consistent findings related to achievement have been as follows:

1. All students gain.
2. The students identified in greatest need are the students who gain the most.

Consequently, the learning gap narrows between disproportionate populations.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Observation data demonstrate gains in the number of teacher/student interactions and a reduction in disparity. In evaluating the training, teachers report many benefits of the program and recommend it highly to their peers. The benefits can be measured by teacher support of the program, an increase in the number of teacher/student interactions, a reduction in the degree of disparity, and a decrease in the rate of gender bias. Participants report that the benefits of the program include an improvement in

teaching and equity in the classroom. Observers report dramatic changes in the classroom climate. In summary, the GESA program has proven to be a successful model, both in the scope and rate of dissemination and in the content analysis of its effectiveness. It demonstrates an approach to educational excellence which utilizes equity as a criterion.

Persistent Problem Areas

- Issues pertaining to educational equity are still not perceived to be of critical concern to large numbers of educators, researchers and policymakers
- Lack of willingness to invest the time, money and effort needed to implement an effective approach to achieving success for all students
- Time and trained personnel to meet all of the requests for services and materials
- Need to move beyond first level consciousness and expand research
- Need for collaborative, longitudinal research on the international level

II. Site-Based Leadership Development

A synthesis of the literature on effective and/or high achieving schools identified specific behaviors exhibited by principals. These include a school-wide emphasis on achievement, participation in setting instructional goals and strategies, providing a safe and orderly environment/atmosphere, systematically monitoring students progress on a regular basis, expressing high expectations for students and staff, coordinating instructional programs, openly communicating and expressing support for teachers, assisting teachers in securing available resources and making regular visits to classrooms (Sweeney, 1982; Shakeshaft, 1987; McCune, 1987; Edmonds, 1982; Brookover, 1978; and Larsen, 1986).

The handbook for this component includes worksheets developed in collaboration with McCune which focus on the major function areas for principals and other site administrators. These categories include providing 1) curriculum and instructional leadership; 2) school management leadership, which includes managing fiscal, physical and human resources, resulting in an orderly, safe, productive environment; 3) staff development leadership, organizing and assisting with staff development activities which result in a well-informed, competent and cohesive staff; and, 4) parent and community outreach leadership, which results in active community understanding and support.

These sources provided the body of literature and research base for the program and leadership seminar which was developed and implemented, entitled The Equity Principal: An Inclusive Approach to Excellence. The spelling in the title has been used as an attention-getting device. The target population for the program is primarily principals, other site administrators and administrative aspirants. The Equity Principal program provides an inclusive approach to excellence

by identifying principals as key personnel in educational leadership models and by sensitizing these administrators to the role equity issues play in attaining curricular and instructional excellence, strategic planning and restructuring efforts.

A. Program Development

In order to ensure an equitable and/or inclusive approach to educational excellence, administrators need to be provided with a knowledge of equity issues and how to incorporate them into effective education. This is the purpose of the program. It was designed to meet the following objectives: To provide participants with an overview of equity principles and effective schooling research; to increase awareness of classroom disparity; to expand observation and supervision skills to include equity issues related to curriculum, teacher-student interactions and learning environment; and to share research-based strategies, techniques and resources with which to address disparities and improve student achievement and teacher effectiveness.

The total program includes 1) a series of workshops for site administrators and administrative aspirants; 2) a two day leadership training which equips participants to share the information with other colleagues and to conduct workshops; 3) a handbook of handouts, resources and references for workshop participants.

Phase One

Building on what had been learned from previous studies and workshop experiences with teachers, the results were compiled to be shared with administrators. From 1985 to 1987, preliminary materials and procedures for a series of workshops were developed with several clusters of principals and other administrators from California, Washington, Oregon, Wisconsin, New York, North Carolina and Montana. This portion served as a needs assessment for the next phase during which the leadership seminars were developed.

Phase Two

From March, 1987 to March, 1990, the research was updated and the Leadership Seminar was developed and implemented utilizing the information and materials developed for and with the site administrators in Phase One. The purpose of this phase was to develop a cadre of practitioners equipped to model the concepts in their own sites and to conduct workshops and/or classes with current and future educational administrators.

B. Target Population

The leadership seminar has been designed for anyone in a position to convene and/or influence site administrators or those aspiring to be in educational administration. The original implementation was conducted with eight clusters, averaging a minimum of over twenty-four participants each, for a total population of one hundred and ninety-three participants, with ten states represented. These states included South Dakota, North Dakota, Washington, Kansas, Hawaii, New York, Michigan, Iowa, Florida and New Mexico. The clusters were conducted in South Dakota, Washington, Kansas (two sites), Hawaii, New York, Michigan and Iowa. Out of the 193 participants, over half were female (52%) and these represented the following groups:

African-American	10%	(19)
Asian-American or Pacific Islander	9%	(17)
European-American	30.5%	(59)
Hispanic-American	1.5%	(3)
Native-American	1.0%	(2)
	52.0%	(100)

Males were 48% of the total population and represented the following groups:

African-American	5%	(10)
Asian-American or Pacific Islander	5%	(10)
European-American	35%	(67)
Hispanic-American	2.5%	(5)
Native-American	5%	(1)
	48.0%	(93)

Totals for the various racial/ethnic groups represented were as follows:

African-American	15%	(29)
Asian-American or Pacific Islander	14%	(27)
European-American	65%	(126)
Hispanic-American	4%	(8)
Native-American	2%	(3)
	100%	(193)

Every attempt was made to obtain a diverse total population in order that the principles of the program might be demonstrated in the seminars and in the feedback, and to assess the diverse applicability of the materials and activities. Since a major portion of the preliminary work had been done in California, that state was not included in this phase. A close examination of the data by clusters reveals that administrators who identified as African-American were disproportionately represented in Michigan, (they were all with the same large, urban district) and under represented elsewhere. Those who identified as Asian or Pacific Islander-Americans were limited to Hawaii and Washington. Participants identifying as European-Americans were predominate in all but two clusters, Hawaii and Michigan. Females out numbered male participants in all but two clusters, Iowa and New York. Participants who identified as Native-American were from the Iowa and South Dakota clusters and participants who identified as Hispanic-American were in the clusters from Kansas, Michigan and Iowa. (See Figure 1.) Clearly, Hispanic-Americans were the most under represented based on the proportion of students in the population, though many groups were disproportionately represented.

The methods for selection of participants varied, depending on the cluster and the coordinating agency and/or agent. Most clusters were coordinated through a national network of equity specialists and other educators representing state departments of education, regional educational labs, local school districts and institutes of higher learning. Many were the results of collaborative efforts. For example, the South Dakota and Iowa clusters were sponsored by the State Departments of Education. In Kansas and Michigan, local school districts co-sponsored with the State Department of Education and/or the Regional Equity Assistance Center. In Washington and Hawaii, the State Department of Education and the Regional Educational Lab collaborated and in New York the cluster was hosted by the Board of Cooperative Educational Services and co-sponsored by the State Department of Education.

Figure 1. Target Population

Date	Location	Total Part.	African-American		Asian-American		European-American		Hispanic American		Native-American	
			F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
6/88	So. Dakota (& No. Dakota)	15					8	5			1	1
10/88	Washington	21			4		7	10				
12/88	Kansas (Lawrence)	27	1				14	9	1	2		
12/88	Hawaii	27			13	10	2	2				
12/88	New York	20	1				6	13				
3/89	Michigan	28	13	6			1	5	2	1		
10/89	Kansas (Wichita)	17	2	1			9	5				
11/89	Iowa (Florida & New Mexico)	38	2	3			12	18		2	1	
	Totals	193	19	10	17	10	59	67	3	5	2	1
	Totals %		10%	5%	9%	5%	30.5%	35%	1.5%	2.5%	1%	.5%

Totals:

Females
N= 100 or 52%

Males
N= 93 or 48%

Asian-Americans/
Pacific Islanders
N= 27 or 14%

European-Americans
N= 126 or 65%

Native-Americans
N= 3 or 2%

African-Americans
N= 29 or 15%

Hispanic-Americans
N= 8 or 4%

Selection of participants was determined by the sponsoring agencies. In some instances, this selection involved a rather extensive advertising and application process. Others used top level administrators to make selections and/or recommendations for attendance. Several agencies used the opportunity to host the leadership seminar as an incentive for some of their top advocates. At least three agencies arranged for university credit. Most of the agencies provided lodging, meals and transportation for the participants.

C. Instrumentation - Descriptive Data

1. Participant Information form

Participant Information forms were completed by all but one participant and returned. For purposes of analysis, descriptive data were collected on the characteristics of the target population which participated in the leadership seminars. These included gender, race, age, (all optional) number of years as a professional educator, highest degree attained, grade level(s) served, number of students served, perceived ability and perceived socioeconomic levels of the student population represented. The results will be analyzed in section D.

2. Seminar Content feedback

The training activities and handouts in the Administrator handbook are designed to acquaint participants with the research and to provide administrators with an opportunity to review and apply action research and self-assessment on effective schooling practices, including what they can do to maximize the potential for all students to achieve. Participants are encouraged to make observations on their campuses utilizing information studied in the workshop. In addition, the materials provide resources and strategies to be shared with staff and other administrators.

a. Principal Function Worksheets

A major portion of the content focuses on the characteristics of effective schools and identifies four major function areas of focus for effective site administrators. The worksheets provide the participants with an opportunity to conduct a self-assessment and set priorities as indicated by the results. During the leadership seminars, participants were asked to respond individually, then to work with others in small groups, responding to the following statements.

1) To what extent are these functions being carried out at your site?
2) What are the equity issues related to this topic?
3) Are there any common barriers or concerns?
4) What recommendations or suggestions can you make to the group in a summary report? Summary reports on each function area were made to the total group.

b. Self-Evaluation Chart

The Administrator's Self-Evaluation of Equitable Behavior is a 32 item survey designed to identify what may be unconscious biased behaviors in dealing with staff and students. As stated in the instrument, the checklist is to be used as an exercise in personal growth and awareness and not for judgmental purposes. The process used in the leadership seminar was to have participants complete the survey, then discuss it with a partner. The entire group then identified and discussed items of particular interest or concern in each section.

c. Self-Observation Chart

After introducing and/or reviewing the areas of disparity in classrooms and the critical interaction patterns between teachers and students, participants in the leadership seminar were presented with a Comparative Matrix designed for administrators. The Matrix indicates areas of disparity among adults in education. Since most administrators have a background in teaching, many of the same interaction patterns and similar dynamics are found between administrators and staff.

Seminar participants identified characteristics most commonly associated with perceived high achieving staff members and low achieving staff members. They were then introduced to the self-observation chart and encouraged to select target staff members with whom they would note their interaction patterns. The chart was designed in response to the preliminary clusters during phase one.

d. Site Observation Chart

This chart is designed to be used during regular duties as the participants walk around their sites and visit classrooms. It is a simple form which targets basic indicators of a setting which may contribute to an inclusive/exclusive environment. These indicators may cause students to deal themselves in and/or out of the educational process.

The observers are encouraged to spend a minimum of 15 to 20 minutes in at least two classrooms during which time they make notations regarding teacher-student interaction patterns (as discussed from the research) , bulletin boards and other displays, the grouping and organization of the students (arrangement, relationship to teacher, who sits and works with whom, etc.), and the content of the curriculum being taught, as well as the materials being used.

In addition, as the observers continue to stroll around their sites, they are directed to make notations about posters and other visual displays (what are the messages to students about what people are like, what they can and can't do, what's appropriate" and "inappropriate" and are all students

represented?) When students are observed informally in the halls, cafeteria, activity areas, etc., who sits/stands with whom? What activities are they involved in? What is the mix of the groups? In trophy and display cases, who is represented? What is recognized for special attention? On playgrounds or athletic fields, what is the mix of the groups? What sports or activities are they involved in? What equipment or facilities are being used and by whom?

In the Library/Resource/Media Centers, participants are asked to note the books and magazines on display, who is portrayed and what messages are carried? Which groups are represented and what are they doing? Select ten biographies from the 900 section and note the gender and race of the central figure. Listen to the characteristics of the protagonists when teachers are reading to students and/or students are reading to each other. Finally, participants are encouraged to go to the science reference section and randomly select five to ten books. They are asked to average the copyright dates of their selection and make notations about the relevance to today's student for tomorrow's world.

The site observation form is designed to elicit a great deal of information in a short amount of time. Because it is openended, participants can make additional observations. It can be used as a basis for discussion, a needs assessment, and/or a frame of reference for the participants when making presentations to others.

e. Basic Compliance Survey and District/School Observation Checklist

These two instruments are provided for the purposes of providing participants with checklists which may be used to determine basic compliance with anti-discrimination laws. Because administrators are responsible for meeting legal mandates, these items and a resource section pertaining to legal issues are included in the handbook (Grayson, 1988 & 1990).

3. Participant Evaluation

At the end of each leadership seminar, participants were asked to complete a written evaluation. These will be summarized in section D.

4. Action Planning Form

Participants were provided with forms designed to have them share their plans for action as a result of their participation in the leadership seminar. These were utilized in assessing the impact of the seminars and will be summarized and interpreted in section D.

D. Data Analysis and Interpretation of Results

It is important to note that all of the participants perceived themselves and/or were perceived by their district officials as effective educational leaders or expressed a desire to be effective. They were also identified as having an interest and/or sensitivity to equity issues. Their interest levels and issues varied a great deal. For example, some were primarily interested in race, some in gender, others in socioeconomic class, etc. A major challenge was in drawing the parallels between and within concerns. The research base had a focus on gender and race studies, but the content trends and conceptual framework were applicable to gender, race, disability, national origin and socioeconomic class. Any issue that deals people out or permits them to deal themselves out of the system, class or process was considered to be an equity issue.

The percentage of females participating in the clusters far exceeds the percentage of females in the resource pool of school administrators nationally. In fact, the diversity of the population is probably more indicative of the interest in equity-related issues by members of under represented groups than of the resource pool.

Participant Information

In many instances the completion of the participant form appeared to be a consciousness raising activity in itself. For example, asking the participant to identify a racial/ethnic background provided some interesting results. The terminology used in this report is the result of extensive deliberation and discussion and choices based on an attempt at equitable description, not a final solution. Knowing the difficulty of working with labels, the descriptors were used as springboards for discussion about the diversity within groups. Those identifying as European-American included Polish, Russian, Swedish, Armenian, German, Irish, English, Lebanese, Ukranian, Slavic, Dutch, Norwegian, Celtic, and Scottish. Individuals identifying as Asian/Pacific Islander-Americans specified Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Portuguese and Native Hawaiian. Hispanic-American participants included Mexican and Puerto Rican and Native American included the Oglala and Lakota Sioux and Winnebago nations. Only four participants identified as African-American referred to themselves as "Black" and they were from the same district. The remaining twenty-five utilized the more recent descriptor proposed by many African-American leaders. Age and geographical location appears to influence individual preference for terminology among all groups.

As mentioned previously, the diversity of this population exceeds the representation of groups in educational administration nationally. Considering the importance of role models, this lack of diverse

representation among educational leaders, administrators and teachers is indicative of one of the major equity issues. It is still very much a white male bastion and reportedly, many of the participants represented the only exception in their respective districts. Meanwhile, student demographics continue to change and become more diverse at a rapid pace, even in "remote" areas. As indicated, the major portion of the participants were site administrators. Other positions represented included staff development and curriculum consultants and equity specialists from Departments of Education and Regional Centers, Project Directors, Administrative Training Center Directors, Central Office Administrators, Chapter I Directors, Library Media Specialists, local Curriculum and Staff Development Coordinators, Secondary and Elementary Education Directors, Effective Schools Liaison, and Directors of Indian Education. Out of 192 responses, fourteen participants had obtained a bachelor's degree, plus a professional certificate, twenty-eight had obtained a doctoral degree and the remaining 150 had obtained a Master's degree. A total of 192 respondents averaged 17.7 years as professional educators for a total of 3,395 years in the educational profession. The average age was 44.3 years. Out of the total group, 153 respondents estimated that they worked with a total enrollment of 1,689,318 students. This figure included a state consultant who listed 500,000 students (in Iowa) and a New York City administrator who estimated one million. Estimates on perceived ability levels of students ranged from high to low with most falling in the average, low and mixed categories. Estimates on perceived socioeconomic levels of students ranged from low to high with most falling in the middle, low and mixed categories.

Participants represented educational sites serving Pre K-12; Pre K-5 or 6; 6 or 7-12; and, Post-Secondary. According to the data from 165 respondents, the grade levels represented were as follows:

Pre K-12:	15%	(24)
(Elem.) Pre K-5 or 6:	39%	(64)
(Sec.) 6 or 7-12:	45%	(75)
Post-secondary:	1%	(2)

B. Seminar Content

1. Principal Function Worksheets

Feedback from the function worksheets was collected during small group summary reports and participant discussions. Participants in the leadership seminars expressed very positive reactions to the format and content of the worksheets and found the individual assessment followed by the small group processing to be very beneficial. In every group, the extent to which the functions were happening varied. Most agreed that whether or not it was happening depended primarily on the principal. The emphasis for the function areas is not on the principal doing everything, but on the principal assuming

the responsibility to ensure that all items are completed through delegation and participatory leadership.

Samples of the equity-related concerns and recommendations identified by the participants for each function area are as follows:

a. Curriculum and Instructional Leadership

- Develop and articulate written goals which specifically address gender, ethnicity, race, culture, socioeconomic class, disability and a commitment to equity issues as a priority.
- Utilize an equitable participatory process in development of goals.
- Encourage curriculum to be driven by district goals based on student needs, rather than having a curriculum driven by textbooks .
- Ensure that curriculum content reflects an equitable balance during development.
- Consider interdisciplinary needs and approaches to skill development.
- Utilize function worksheet items when developing school improvement plans.
- Facilitate resource acquisition and provide equitable treatment and support for all teachers.
- Emphasize importance of pluralistic/multicultural studies on self-esteem and social development of students.
- Revise testing, screening and other assessment procedures to dispel biased implications and tracking and incorporate qualitative and quantitative approaches designed to measure varied learning styles and student backgrounds.

The latter item will require a grassroots outcry and refusal to continue to use the existing standardized tests, inventories and placement instruments, most of which have been proven to be invalid predictors of success or failure for many students. For example, the State of New York eliminated use of the perceived biased SAT as a scholarship factor. From an economic and political perspective the corporate owned, endowed, funded and governed publishers and developers of educational materials, visual and technological teaching aids, and commercially packaged and marketed tests and assessment instruments may well be the major barriers to implementing an equitable curriculum and instructional program in public education in the next century. The rich, the powerful and the politically influential simply fear that they have too much to lose, and as products of an institutionalized elitist, sexist and racist system they are perpetuating the limitations passed to them.

b. School Management Leadership

- Assess and improve the physical environment to eliminate structural barriers, labels, signs and stereotypical messages.

- Allocate funds and facilities pro-actively, articulating and demonstrating a commitment to equity as a criterion for excellence.
- Resist permitting community members and students to conduct inequitable and/or illegal fund raisers and/or activities under the auspices of the school and/or utilizing school facilities.
- Incorporate equity impact study/analysis into all school facility planning, budget planning, discipline procedures, teen parenting, "at-risk" and drop-out prevention programs.
- Monitor use of teacher budgets, field trips, awards, class size allocations, supplemental pay, special education, gifted and advanced placement enrollments.
- Review guidelines for recruitment, interviewing and hiring practices, staffing patterns, selection process for School Advisory Councils and other committees to ensure balanced representation. (Consider advertising, going to other states and geographical locations, providing incentive programs and staff exchange programs to break traditional staffing patterns and increase resource pool.)
- Articulate school needs and priorities with district officials and community members.

c. **Staff Development Leadership**

- Assume the initiative to provide monthly activities, share professional publications and articles, posters, and visuals demonstrating equitable examples and infuse equity into all content and process training. Most Staff Development efforts are reactive rather than proactive and in response to district directives.
- Collaborate with entire staff on development of building level teams which review job responsibilities and performance standards; conduct needs assessment including informal peer observation; identify needs and develop training requests; design a short-range and long-range plan, implement and evaluate to measure if needs are being met, revise as needed; and monitor each step for equity implications, including diverse representation on building teams.
- Make staff aware of district, state and regional resources available and utilize available materials, people, funding sources and incentive grants to enrich professional development activities.
- Provide release time and support for participation in professional organizations and activities including follow-up feedback and sharing time with peers.
- Include equity as a priority in the development of performance plan objectives tied to professional development activities.
- Provide long-term professional development activities which include research, application components and peer feedback, encouraging team work and collaboration, group problem solving and shared successes.
- Identify site-based staff development coordinators, due to the importance of meaningful professional development activities.

All clusters agreed that there is a need to include basic awareness information regarding equity at the pre-service level in teacher education programs and administrative education programs. There is also a need to pass legislation which ties teacher and administrator certification to an equity-related requirement, acquainting all educators with the state and federal anti-discrimination mandates and the impact on curriculum, interaction patterns and the learning environment. This preservice certification requirement could eventually eliminate the need for so many flash and dash consciousness-raising workshops during inservice which may momentarily get people's attention but seldom has any lasting effect on change.

Professional development activities for practitioners need to be able to move beyond first level consciousness activities to in-depth analysis, problem-solving, solution-oriented sessions which make the connection between equity and existing educational priorities. Equity cannot continue to be treated as a fragmented addendum to "more important" educational issues. It must be a criterion for excellence and infused into everything associated with education. Professional development activities need to reflect this premise.

d. Parent/Community Outreach Leadership

- Participate in and sponsor community events which recognize, emphasize and exemplify mutual respect, appreciation, value and contributions of all members.
- Provide cross-cultural information, activities and workshops targeted toward parents and community groups.
- Incorporate diverse representation from the community on all planning committees, advisory councils, volunteer programs and fundraising drives.
- Reflect and share the changing demographics and emerging needs of the total community in all presentations, activities and written communications.
- Assist parents and community members in accessing and understanding the building, information, scholarships, paraprofessional services and opportunities.
- Be aware that most traditional educational attitudes and practices toward parents/families assume two parents (heterosexual), two children, a day working male as the primary earner, and a female stay-at-home childcare worker. (In fact, this represented one out of every fourteen (7%) family structures reported in the 1980 U.S. census.) This mythical assumption has created a number of concerns pertaining to student participation in sports and activities, student fees, conferencing (for parents and students), phone services, non-custodial parent consideration, childcare, "latchkey" problems, clothing, parental involvement, transitory students, mobility issues, etc.
- Be willing to go in to the community for meetings and activities and involve representatives from community organizations (churches, service clubs, business) in planning.

Reportedly, many parents and community members did not have positive educational experiences and may feel intimidated by or hostile toward educational agencies. Others are simply physically and emotionally exhausted from meeting the demands of parenting, housing, feeding and clothing their children. Others are caught up in the pressures of their own employment and have neither the time nor the desire to be involved.

Educational leaders must take the initiative to reach out, to facilitate parent and community involvement, to share transportation, to provide psychological, emotional and fiscal support, including supplemental health and food services and crises intervention. Parents and community members need to be made to feel heard and comfortable and parental suggestions need to be acted on and provided with feedback and follow-up. More than ever, the role of the educational leader requires public relations skills, political acuity, an open heart, and public accountability. Successful educational efforts for the future depend on a wholistic and collaborative approach by all of the significant adults and influential forces in a student's life.

2. Self-Evaluation Charts

These preliminary assessment forms were discussed with participants in each cluster. More often than not, participants reported needing to improve in the following areas:

- Behavioral expectations - student discipline
- Academic expectations for all students
- Budgetary allocations with staff.

This chart was completed during the first portion of the seminar and the participants expressed a general agreement that the items had much more meaning following group discussion and additional training. As the training progressed, other improvement areas were identified, as indicated by the evaluations and action plans.

3. Self-Observation Chart

This chart was used as a self-assessment activity during the leadership seminar. Participants shared characteristics which they perceived to be associated with high and low achieving staff members. This activity was a real eye-opener for many of the participants. A general response was agreement that many classroom behaviors from teaching carry over into staff dynamics. This feeling was expressed repeatedly by statements like "How can we complain about how teachers treat students when we see us doing the same things with teachers?" One female elementary principal said "I never knew that I 'badgered' my male teachers so much!" Based on the responses, the power of example became a very real concept during this activity. Most agreed that they tended to avoid their perceived low

achieving staff members and did not initiate as many opportunities for positive interaction with them. Many were also amazed to find that the gender and race factors influenced their perceptions of perceived ability. During the developmental phase of the program a more detailed chart had been used to tally this activity. However, all clusters agreed that the more open, narrative format was preferable.

4. Site Observation Chart

Most of the classroom observations on interaction patterns read like the research. Reportedly, there were major differences between the frequency distribution of attention to males and females in most classes, with males receiving more attention from the teacher. The "squeaky wheels" were easy to identify and the quiet ones became more invisible as the class continued. Other observations pertaining to interaction patterns included disparity in the use of students names, labeling students with terms such as "guys" (for groups of males and females) and a reluctance to involve low socioeconomic students and students for whom English was not the dominant language.

Bulletin boards and other visual displays consisted predominantly of student work or were commercially prepared. Participants suggested that student work be monitored for equitable representation (whose papers were selected for display?) and content. Many commercial products were found to be stereotypical with polaroid displays of actual students appearing to be most equitable. In general, bulletin boards tend to focus on content, not people.

There continues to be classroom organization and lines based on gender, especially at the elementary level. In addition, participants agreed that there continues to be identifiable subcultures on secondary sites associated with the characteristics of being 1) Social 2) "Nerdy" or "Bookworm" 3) Athletes or "Jocks" 4) Anti-social or "Freaks", "Druggies", etc. and 5) Money, which could cross groups. Depending on the site and community, these groups could have gender, class and race-related ramifications.

One participant pointed out that student selection is influenced by the role perception of the school. The role perception for many people in the underserved populations is that schools are perceived as white, middle class turf and those which are not have negative reputations. There was general agreement with this opinion, and it is noteworthy that Rodney Reed's work on shaping teacher expectations for minority students has identified school reputation as having influence on minority student expectations and choices.

In general, contact and interaction between genders, cross-culturally, continues to appear to be based primarily on sexual attraction and family roles. This stereotypical representation is the primary basis for connection portrayed in curriculum materials and content. Other curriculum issues identified

included holiday rituals and minimal options portrayed and the lack of multilingual emphasis and materials.

Perusal of science reference books yielded an average copyright date of 1964 in one large urban district. Available biographies for student use averaged a minimum of a 3 to 1 ratio male to female. (One participant couldn't believe the results of a sample and continued to count, stopping with a total of 76. The final count was 63 males and 13 females.) The library/resource area was identified as a major area of impact and concern by a majority of participants in all clusters.

Reportedly, when students are participating in informal play, sports and other activities, groups were mixed by race more often than not, but not mixed by gender in many instances. This was also true in elementary cafeteria settings when students could choose their own seating. Additional results included disproportionate enrollment/representation in advanced placement and pull-out programs and discipline referrals, indicating that previously identified research trends persist. All participants agreed that the indicators suggested in the site observation could be used on an on-going basis during day-to-day activities.

5. Basic Compliance Survey and District/School Observation Checklist

These instruments were not collected for analysis. As stated earlier, they were provided for use by the participants as desired and/or needed. They were adapted and utilized in 1982 to develop a compliance profile and needs assessment for technical assistance and training in Los Angeles County (95 districts, K - 14). Prior to that time, they had been developed and used with districts throughout California by personnel from the State Department of Education's Civil Rights Office (Landers and Grayson, 1980). Participants in the leadership seminar clusters expressed appreciation for having this information provided.

6. Participant Evaluations

These forms were distributed to all participants, completed and collected during the last hour of the leadership seminar. As explained earlier, they were designed to elicit what the participants perceived to be "most beneficial" about the seminar, suggestions for improvement and overall reaction. 78% of the target population to whom forms were distributed responded as follows:

a. In item one (most beneficial), responses clustered into six distinctive groups:

- Knowledge: Obtaining a better understanding and/or awareness of equity and the relationship to effective schools/excellence;
- Interacting/sharing ideas/networking with other participants;

Figure 2.

Participant Evaluation Results

1. Most Beneficial:

	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Knowledge	44	22%
Networking	44	22%
Content	41	21%
Processes	29	15%
Handbook	25	13%
Personal	13	7%

2. Suggestions for Improvement

	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Handbook	27	31%
Time	27	31%
How To...	20	24%
More GESA Info	7	8%
Logistics	5	6%

3. Overall Reaction

	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Excellent	68	62%
Good	33	30%
Fair	7	6%
Disappointing	2	2%

- Content of the seminar, research, resources and information shared;
- Implementation strategies, processes and activities shared;
- Written materials/administrator handbook provided; and
- Personal growth, validation, reinforcement and/or inspiration achieved.

Out of 192 responses, number 1, Knowledge: Obtaining a better understanding of equity and the relationship to excellence and number 2, Networking/Sharing with other administrators was identified 44 times (22%) each; the Content (research/resources/information) was identified as most beneficial 41 times (21%); the Process (implementation strategies/activities) was listed as most beneficial by 29 (15%); the Written Materials/Handbook was most beneficial to 25 (13%) respondents; and 13 (7%) listed Personal Growth. (See Figure 2.)

b. There were a total of 86 suggestions for improvement. These related to the handbook, time constraints (request for more/less, faster/slower pace), processes (more how to...), logistics and a need for more GESA-related information or GESA as a pre-requisite. A major portion (62%) of the suggestions (27 or 31% each) was related to the handbook and time. Many of these were used to make changes and refine the seminar from one cluster to the next. Twenty responses (24%) dealt with requests for more how to...suggestions. The most frequent suggestion was related to pagination of the materials and a need for more time to process and digest the information. On the other end of the spectrum, over two-thirds of the participants had no suggestions for improvement (See Figure 2).

c. The 110 comments in the "Overall Reaction" section were mostly clustered into three obvious categories with words such as "excellent, very good, great, super, very informative, very pleased and finest ever" in category one; "positive, favorable, successful, beneficial, enjoyable, good, useful, practical and needed" were in category two; and "mixed, fair, already aware" in group three. Sixty-two percent of the responses were in group one, 30% of the responses were in group two and only 6% of the responses were in the latter category. Two participants (2%) expressed disappointment. They were both from the same cluster (Figure 2).

Based on the participant evaluation responses, the primary objectives of the content of the program appear to have been met. In addition, the processes used and the materials developed were all perceived to have been successful and continue to be disseminated at the national level.

7. Written Action Plans -

Participants were asked to develop written action plans during the last hour of the seminar. The purpose was to 1) determine what, if any follow-up work/activities/ ideas were generated by the

seminar and, 2) any presentation plans to share with staff and/or other educational professionals during the year following the seminar. The plans to take action represented the impact measurement.

Out of 143 responses pertaining to activities/ideas and work planned during the two week period following the seminar, over one-third (37%) related to sharing the information with other staff and/or supervisors immediately. Fifteen percent planned to focus on their own behavior and needed changes, ten percent planned to survey the compliance status and/or focus on needed procedural changes, ten percent planned to review the workshop materials/handbook, eight percent planned to network with other agencies, eight percent planned to review GESA materials and/or pursue additional training, six percent planned to focus their follow-up efforts on teacher-student interaction patterns and the final 6 percent of the responses addressed review of curriculum and visual resources.

In the written plans for the year following the seminar, 63% of the responses indicated a plan to present and/or conduct workshops for other administrators, teachers, board members and parents. This percentage rate represents over six times the national average (estimated to be less than 10%) of turn around training reported from other well known staff development programs. In addition to presentations, 18% of the responses indicated plans to conduct additional observations and/or surveys, 18% expressed an intention to meet with supervisors to develop a plan and one percent simply planned to incorporate the information into their job responsibilities.

Requests for assistance with the implementation of the written plans included more training and information on GESA workshops for the teachers, and human resources from other networking agencies. Only three participants mentioned funding and/or money and three mentioned time constraints.

Based on the written action plans, the leadership seminar appears to be successful in equipping a majority of the participants with materials, activities, and the confidence to leave the seminar ready and willing to share their experiences and information with other educational personnel.

E. Summary: Limitations/Recommendations/Implications

Building on what had been learned from previous studies and workshop experiences and preliminary materials developed and utilized during Phase One, it was decided that the most expedient delivery system for the administrator program was a training-for-trainers or leadership seminar format. Due to time, resource and budgetary constraints, most districts prefer to send representatives to training sessions and conferences with the expectation that their representative(s) will return equipped to share with others. This capacity building model is very popular with districts and has proven to be a very

successful approach for program development and assimilation. This approach is credited with the successful implementation of the leadership seminars from 1990 to the present.

With the cooperation of several state and regional educational agencies, eight clusters of principals and other administrators were convened for two days each over a two year period. Participants were presented with the purpose, overview, rationale, and objectives of the program. They were provided with participant information forms and self-evaluation forms designed to assess unconscious biased behaviors in dealing with staff members and students.

The content of the leadership seminar included materials which provided the participants with an opportunity to review and apply action research and self-assessment on effective schooling practices. The materials included resources and strategies to be shared with other administrators. A major focus of the content was to infuse equity concepts and information into four function areas identified from the literature on effective principals.

A number of equity-related concerns and recommendations were identified by the participants for each function area. In addition, most of the research findings pertaining to curriculum, interaction patterns and learning environment were validated through small group discussion, summary reports, self observations and individual written assessments. Using an open-ended written evaluation form, the respondents repeatedly identified six distinctive benefits from the seminar. Each of the benefits related directly to the original purpose and objectives of the program.

Approximately one-third of the participants offered suggestions for improvement. Many of these suggestions were incorporated as the seminars were refined from one cluster to the next. Ninety-two percent of the respondents gave the seminar an overall rating of excellent or good. Over two-thirds of the respondents stated in writing that they planned to present and/or conduct workshops for other administrators, teachers, board members and parents during the year following the seminar. Limitations encountered with the implementation during phase two included 1) determining the optimum length of time for the seminar and 2) realistic expectations on the part of the participants regarding their own training ability. The leadership seminar appears to be most successful with those participants who arrive in a state of "readiness" with a desire to improve education and a willingness to grow and to share with others. Clearly the content and processes included are not intended for anyone satisfied with the status quo in education. The seminar is not designed to be therapeutic for "those who really need it." It is designed for those who already believe there is a need. It is not intended to be a panacea nor does it provide magic wands. The success of the program and any changes are totally dependent on the willingness of the participants to get involved, to participate in the activities and to

do the assignments. Anyone looking for a quick fix or answer will not find it here. Education did not get to the current state overnight, and the problems will not be solved that quickly. However, the body of knowledge exists if we are willing to learn and apply what we know. The fact is there are a number of things educators and policymakers can do to make a major difference in the lives and future of traditionally underserved populations. It really is a matter of whether or not we choose to do so.

As a result of this work, the following recommendations are suggested:

- There needs to be an accelerated and increased focus on preparation, recruitment and hiring of diverse representatives for educational leadership. It is doubtful that there will be extensive major changes in many of these issues until there are major changes in the make-up of those in the positions of leadership, preservice training and credentialing decisions. Educational leadership has the potential of being in a major position for societal change in the 21st century, but those interested in change will have to take the initiative.

- It is time for this country to come to grips with the effect that institutionalized racism, sexism and elitism in all its forms has had on all of its people and the role that education has played in perpetuating these negative forces. The evidence is too great. We are past the point of philosophical debate. It is time for educational professionals to assume a role of leadership in countering these effects. In a democratic society public educators have a responsibility to equip all students to be contributing, participating, self-supporting members of the society. There is a need for measures to be taken at every level which ensure that all human beings will be valued and treated with dignity. These measures need to be expressed in policies and included in certification, licensing and hiring procedures for all people who work in the public domain.

- Researchers and program developers need to concentrate on ways to equip educators to work with diversity as a gift that enhances learning, instead of always treating it as a problem to be solved. We need to capitalize on the diversity of our population, emphasize what can be learned from sharing our differences and identify and appreciate our similarities.

- Educational leaders need to publicize the positive and let the public know about the successes. There is a need to have a more obvious influence on the media. The age of electronic telecommunications can be a major asset in giving the public new images or it can bury us in traditional and negative stereotypes.

- Educational leaders need to initiate the contact with business and community members and help shape a wholistic agenda for educating all of the public. Our societal needs are determined and

reflected in the needs of the individuals and all citizens deserve the opportunity, access, instruction and resources to develop to the extent of their own desire, interest and ability.

- The major challenge of education is to equip today's students to participate as members of a global community and to help them understand the necessity for living productive lives in peaceful coexistence and harmony with the earth and all of its inhabitants. To rise to the occasion and meet the needs of today's students for tomorrow's world is a challenge for which there is no global model but which we can not afford to ignore.

There are a number of implications for future work which have resulted from these efforts. The fact that so many practitioners were willing to give their time and energy to focus on the topic of equity as it relates to excellence was very encouraging. Equity is still not understood and/or perceived as a priority and a problem with semantics continues to exist. These programs have provided a source for data and practitioner contacts which can be utilized for a number of future projects. A next step could be to begin a follow-up study with site visitations and interviews. There is no doubt that a number of model sites and practices could be identified from these participants. We've never really known what a truly equitable environment and approach to education could yield for the students involved. Perhaps this work is a beginning to a more formal, in-depth, longitudinal study in the future.

Bibliography

Adams, R. S. and B. J. Biddle. *Realities of Teaching: Explorations with Video Tape.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

American Association of University Women. *Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America.* Washington, D.C. : The Analysis Group, Inc. January, 1991.

____. *Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America,* Washington, D.C.: Wellesley Research Center on Women, February, 1992.

Baumgartner-Papageorgiou, A. *"My Daddy Might Have Loved Me:" Student Perceptions of Differences Between Being Male and Being Female.* Denver: Institute for Equality in Education, University of Colorado, 1982. (Available from Colorado Dept. of Education.)

Brookover, W. B., et al. "Elementary School Social Climate and School Achievement." *American Educational Research Journal* 15:2 (1978): 101-318.

Best, R. *We've All Got Scars: What Boys and Girls Learn in Elementary School.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983, Revised & reprinted, 1989.

Brophy, J. and T. Good. Teachers Communications of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance: Some Behavioral Data. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 61, 1970, 356-74.

Campbell, P. B. Girls, Boys and Educational Excellence. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April, 1984.

Edmonds, R.; Rosenshine, B.; and Mortimore, P. (Speakers-Videocassette) Teacher and School Effectiveness. Alexandria, VA.: ASCD.

Fennema, Elizabeth and Penelope L. Peterson. Autonomous Learning Behavior: A Possible Explanation of Sex-Related Differences in Mathematics. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 16, August 1985, 301-311.

___.Teacher-Student Interactions and Sex-Related Differences in Learning Mathematics. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2, 3, 1986, 19-42.

Fifer, Fred, Jr. Effective Classroom Management. *Academic Therapy/21:4*. March, 1986.

Flanders, N. A. Interaction Model of Critical Teaching Behaviors. In An Analysis and Projection of Research in Teacher Education, F. R. Cyphert and E. Spaights, Eds. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, Ohio State University, 1964, 197-218.

Good, T. L., J. N. Sikes, and J. E. Brophy. Effects of Teacher Sex and Student Sex on Classroom Interaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65 (1), 1973, 74-87.

Good, T. L. and J. E. Brophy. *Looking in Classrooms* (2nd & 4th edition). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1978, 1987.

Grant, Linda. Black Females' Place in Desegregated Classrooms. *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 57 #2, April, 1986, 98-110.

Grayson, D.A., and Martin, M.D., *Gender Expectations and Student Achievement: Teachers Handbook*, Downey CA, Los Angeles County Office of Education, 1984; *Gender/Ethnic Expectations and Student Achievement: Teachers Handbook* , Iowa: GrayMill, 1988.

___. *Gender/Ethnic Expectations and Student Achievement: Facilitator Handbook*, Iowa: GrayMill, 1988.

___. "GESA: A Teacher Training Program Addressing Gender Disparity in the Classroom", Paper presented at the American Educational Research (AERA) Associations' annual meeting, New Orleans, 1984. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Bethesda, MD., ED 243-829, 1984.

Grayson, D.A., "Implementing the GESA Teacher Training Program." Paper presented at the AERA annual meeting in Chicago, IL, 1985. Available from ERIC.

___. "Evaluating the Impact of the GESA Program." A paper presented at the AERA annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1987. Available from ERIC.

___. *Designing and Implementing a Research-Based Intervention Program to Transform Education for the 21st Century: An Inclusive Approach to Excellence.* University Microfilms Inc., Ann Arbor, MI, 1991.

Klein, S. ed. *Handbook for Achieving Sex Equity Through Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Larsen, T. Focusing on Effective Instructional Leadership Practice in High Achieving Schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol. 46, #3A, p. 369-A, Microfilm order #85-08956. Ann Arbor,MI: Univerity Microfilms International, 1986.

McCune S. *Managing Educational Change in an Age of Transition*. Aurora, CO.: Learning Trends, Inc. Draft, 1986.

Newsletter *Project Effect*, 1, 1984.

Oakes, J. *Tracking and Inequality Within Schools: Finding from a Study of Schooling*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 187, 814, Bethesda, MD, 1980.

Padilla, E. R. and Wyatt, G. E. The Effects of Intelligence and Achievement Testing on Minority Group Children. In G. J. Powell, J. Yamamoto, A. Romero and A. Morales (eds.). *The Psychosocial Development of Minority Group Children*. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1983, 417-437.

Raby, J. and A. Suite. Classroom Seating Choice and Teacher Perceptions of Students. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 50 (2), Winter, 1981-1982, 64-69.

Rist, R. C. Social Distance and Social Inequality in a Ghetto Kindergarten Classroom. *Urban Education*, 7, October, 1972, 241-260.

Rowe, M. B. Science, Silence and Sanctions. *Science and Children*, 6, 1969, 11-13.

___. "Wait Time: Slowing Down May Be A Way of Speeding Up!" *Journal of Teacher Education*. (January-February 1986): 43-50.

Sadker, D. and M. Sadker. *Sex Equity Handbook for Schools*. New York: Longman, Inc., 1982.

___. "Is the O.K. Classroom O.K.?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 66, January, 1985, 358-61.

Sadker, D. and M. Sadker. Teacher Reactions to Classroom Responses of Male and Female Students. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, April 27, 1984.

Scott-Jones, D. and Clark, M. The School Experience of Black Girls: The Interaction of Gender, Race and Socioeconomic Status. *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 6737, 1986, 520-526.

Serbin, L. et al. A Comparison of Teacher Response to the Pre-academic and Problem Behavior of Boys and Girls. *Child Development*, 44, 1973.

Shakeshaft, C. guest ed. *Phi Delta Kappan* (Women In Education), March, 1986.

__. A Gender at Risk. *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol 67 #7, 1986, 499-503.

Slavin, R. E., N. L. Karweit and N.A. Madden. *Effective Programs for Students at Risk*. MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1989.

Tannen, D. *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1990.

© Grayson, 1992